

**REMARKS**

In the Office Action the Examiner noted that claims 1-8, 11-13, 16, 22, and 23 are pending in the application, and the Examiner rejected all claims. By this Amendment, claims 22 and 23 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer, and claims 1, 11, 12, 13, and 16 have been amended. No new matter has been presented. Thus, claims 1-8, 11-13, and 16 are pending in the application. The Examiner's rejections are traversed below, and reconsideration of all rejected claims is respectfully requested.

**Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §103**

In item 3 on pages 2-5 of the Office Action the Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 8, 12, and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,405,175, issued to Ng (hereinafter referred to as "Ng") in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2006/0143095, issued to Davis et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Davis"). In item 4 on pages 5 and 6 of the Office Action the Examiner rejected claims 4-7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ng and Davis in further view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0051911, issued to Marks et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Marks"). In item 5 on pages 6-8 of the Office Action the Examiner rejected claims 11, 16, 22, and 23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis in view of Marks. By this Amendment, claims 22-23 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. The Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejections of the remaining claims.

The Applicants respectfully submit that Ng fails to disclose or suggest several recited features of claim 1. In Ng, which relates to e-commerce, the "submitting user" is considered the "consumer-user A" of "user A" who submits new information about a product Q (Columns 7-8). Consumer-users are rewarded for entering and correcting product information (Column 13, Lines 36-37). Also, reward points can be given for other activities, such as merely using the product price database or referring other people to the web site (Column 14, Lines 29-31). Additional reward points can be given to the submitting user when another user actually buys the product (Column 14, Lines 59-61). However, the Applicants respectfully submit that Ng does not disclose or suggest the claim 1 features of presenting a first set of keywords from a provider to a first user through a network, registering at least one keyword selected by the first user, storing the at least one registered keyword and the first user, presenting a second set of keywords from

the provider to an advertiser, storing the keyword selected by the advertiser, sending results of a search using the selected and stored keywords from the first user and advertiser along with an advertisement associated with the at least one registered keyword, displaying the results and advertisement on a display screen of the second user's terminal, and giving points to the first user when the second user has referred to the advertisement by clicking the advertisement on the display screen.

The Examiner alleged that Ng discloses a first user being presented a category listing (a keyword), and that the first user further provides information about a product associated with the selected category and is rewarded once a second user has viewed the information regarding the product listed in the category. The Examiner alleged that the category is thus an underlying keyword that is selected by the first user and is not seen as being diverging from the concept of a keyword having to be the product. The Examiner alleged that the advertising features are furthermore taught by Ng, citing claim 4 wherein a person is rewarded for an advertisement viewed, line 53 of column 14 in which advertising revenue are used to fund the database, and line 43 of column 15 in which targeted advertising is implemented.

The Applicants respectfully submit that these allegations by the Examiner are highly improper, and read against any reasonable interpretation of the features of claim 1 of the present application. The category listing presented in Ng is a drop-down list of product categories using category box 53 (Column 6, Lines 39-41). The user A submits information about the category selected, i.e., about a product Q selected (Column 6, Lines 46-51, and Column 7, Lines 61-67). When the user B searches for a product and finds product Q that was entered into the database by user A, the user A receives one additional point for the database "hit" on product Q (Column 8, Lines 33-37). Although the Examiner has repeatedly alleged that this is tantamount to the keyword registration recited in claim 1, it would be quite apparent to one skilled in the art, or even the layman, that there is no possible reasonable interpretation that would arrive in these processes disclosing or suggesting the keyword registration of claim 1.

Assuming, arguendo, that the category list of Ng corresponds to the keyword, user A, or the first user, submits information about product Q which relates to the keyword selected by the first user, and the first user receives one additional point for the database "hit" on product Q when the second user searches for a product and finds product Q that was entered into the database by the first user (Column 8, Lines 33-37). Accordingly, what is indicated in the category list of Ng is, as shown in Figure 3, simply a **general classification of merchandise** such as pc-computers or laptops, which in no way corresponds to a **keyword relating to the**

**advertisement of the advertiser** as recited in claim 1 (emphasis added).

Further, in Ng, since the second user searches for a product and finds product Q that was entered by the first user, Ng fails to disclose or suggest the feature of "in response to a reception of a request for the search from a second user different from the first user through the network, searching the first table and the second table for keywords specified in the request for the search, and when any of the specified keywords is found both in the first table and the second table, **sending results of the search along with an advertisement associated with the at least one registered keyword** in the first table to the second user through the network; [and] **displaying the results and the advertisement on a display screen of the second user's terminal**" (emphasis added). Also, if the category list of Ng corresponds to the first set of keywords recited in claim 1, it is quite apparent that Ng fails to disclose the feature of "**registering at least one keyword selected by the first user**" (emphasis added). There is no such suggestion of anything approaching registration of a presented keyword in the category listings of Ng.

Therefore, Ng fails to disclose or suggest at least these several features of claim 1. Further, these several deficiencies are not cured by Davis and/or Marks. For instance, Davis discloses a search term comprising keywords exemplified as "car", "auto", and "automobile" in Figure 9. These keywords are also general classification of merchandise, as discussed in regard to Ng, and do not correspond to the recited keyword associated with an advertisement of the advertiser. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the cited references.

Claims 2-8 depend from claim 1 and include all of the features of that claim plus additional features which are not disclosed by the cited references. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2-8 also patentably distinguish over the cited references.

Independent claims 11-13 and 16, as amended, recite similar features to those discussed above in regard to claim 1, and which are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 11-13 and 16 also patentably distinguish over the cited references.

### Summary

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 22 and 23 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer, and claims 1, 11, 12, 13, and 16 have been amended. No new matter

has been presented. Thus, claims 1-8, 11-13, and 16 are pending in the application.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: December 9, 2008

By: Thomas L. Jones  
Thomas L. Jones  
Registration No. 53,908

1201 New York Ave, N.W., 7th Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501